

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion and in view of the present amendment, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 7, and 13 have been amended. Claims 6, 9, 12, 14-15, 18, and 22 have been cancelled. Claim 23 has been added. Claims 1, 4-5, 7-8, 10-11, 13, 16-17, 19-21, and 23 are pending and under consideration.

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, at pages 2-4, claims 1, 4-5, 7-11, 13, and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hibi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,546,191).

Hibi et al. does not discuss or suggest:

image recording means for recording, at different time points, a plurality of image contents and image data including sound data from a video input;

randomly accessible data storage means for storing the plurality of image contents and image data including sound data recorded in said image recording means;

sound select means for selecting a sound designated by a user to be output;

and

information processing means for controlling said data storage means, said image displaying means, and said sound selecting means in such a manner that a plurality of image contents recorded in said image recording means at different time points are read from said data storage means and displayed in a single screen by said image displaying means and the sound designated by the user is reproduced,

as recited in amended claim 1. In other words, the invention of claim 1 provides for storing image contents and image data including sound data, such as a broadcast program. Since such image contents and image data constitute a very large amount of data, the invention of claim 1 provides a randomly accessible data storage means, which provides large capacity storage. In contrast, Hibi et al. merely provides that the contents of data in a memory circuit are recorded on a magnetic tape. Therefore, the capacity of the memory circuit is made to be very small in comparison to the randomly accessible data storage of the invention of claim 1. Furthermore, the invention of claim 1 provides for allowing a user to designate a sound to be output and information processing means for reproducing the sound designated by the user. In contrast,

Hibi et al. does not disclose a sound select means for selecting a sound designated by the user to be output and information processing means for reproducing the designated sound.

Since Hibi et al. does not discuss or suggest all of the features of the invention of claim 1, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4-5 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, and include all the features of claim 1, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the reference relied upon. Therefore, claims 4-5 patentably distinguish over the reference relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 102(b) rejections is respectfully requested.

Similarly, Hibi et al. does not discuss or suggest:

- recording, at different time points, a plurality of image contents and image data including sound data from a video input by an image recording means;

- storing the plurality of image contents and image data including sound data from a video input by the image recording means in a randomly accessible data storage;

- selecting a sound designated by a user to be output;

- and

- controlling said data storage, said displaying, and said selecting in such a manner that a plurality of image contents recorded at different time points are read from said data storage and displayed in a single screen and the sound designated by the user is reproduced,

as recited in amended claim 7, so that claim 7 patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 8 and 10-11 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 7, and include all the features of claim 7, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the reference relied upon. Therefore, claims 8 and 10-11 patentably distinguish over the reference relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 102(b) rejections is respectfully requested.

Similarly, Hibi et al. does not discuss or suggest:

- record, at different time points, a plurality of image contents and image data including sound data from a video input;

- store the plurality of image contents and image data including sound data from a video input in a randomly accessible data

storage;
select a sound designated by a user to be output;
and
control said data storage, said image displaying, and said sound selecting in such a manner that a plurality of image contents recorded at different time points are read from said data storage and displayed in a single screen and the sound designated by the user is reproduced,

as recited in amended claim 13, so that claim 13 patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 16-17 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 13, and include all the features of claim 13, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the reference relied upon. Therefore, claims 16-17 patentably distinguish over the reference relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 102(b) rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 has been cancelled. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, at pages 5-7, claims 1, 4-5, 7, 10-11, 13, and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu (U.S. Patent No. 6,311,013) in view of Hirayama (U.S. Patent No. 5,630,006).

Neither Shimizu nor Hirayama discuss or suggest:

image recording means for recording, at different time points, a plurality of image contents and image data including sound data from a video input;

image displaying means for displaying at the same time in one screen a plurality of the image contents recorded at the different time points and read out from said data storage means;

sound select means for selecting a sound designated by a user to be output;

and

information processing means for controlling said data storage means, said image displaying means, and said sound selecting means in such a manner that a plurality of image contents recorded in said image recording means at different time points are read from said data storage means and displayed in a single screen by said image displaying means and the sound designated by the user is reproduced,

as recited in amended claim 1. In other words, the invention of claim 1 provides for simultaneously displaying *a plurality of image contents* that were recorded *at different times*. Shimizu, as relied on by the Examiner, merely discloses simultaneously displaying *the same image* at different angles in the same time frame, which does not correspond to showing a plurality of image contents that were recorded at different times. Also, Hirayama does not disclose displaying a plurality of image contents that were recorded at different times.

Furthermore, the invention of claim 1 provides for allowing a user to designate a sound to be output and information processing means for reproducing the sound designated by the user. In contrast, neither Shimizu nor Hirayama disclose a sound select means for selecting a sound designated by the user to be output and information processing means for reproducing the designated sound. Therefore, even if Shimizu and Hirayama were combined, the invention of claim 1 would not result.

Since neither Shimizu nor Hirayama, nor the combination thereof, discuss or suggest all of the features of the invention of claim 1, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4-5 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, and include all the features of claim 1, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claims 4-5 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

Similarly, neither Shimizu nor Hirayama, nor the combination thereof, discuss or suggest:

- recording, at different time points, a plurality of image contents and image data including sound data from a video input by an image recording means;

- displaying, at the same time in one screen, the plurality of the image contents recorded at the different time points and read out from said data storage;

- selecting a sound designated by a user to be output;

- and

- controlling said data storage, said displaying, and said selecting in such a manner that a plurality of image contents recorded at different time points are read from said data storage and displayed in a single screen and the sound designated by the user is reproduced,

as recited in amended claim 7, so that claim 7 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-11 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 7, and include all the features of claim 7, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claims 10-11 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

Similarly, neither Shimizu nor Hirayama, nor the combination thereof, discuss or suggest:

record, at different time points, a plurality of image contents and image data including sound data from a video input;

display, at the same time in one screen, the plurality of the image contents recorded at the different time points and read out from said data storage;

select a sound designated by a user to be output;

and

control said data storage, said image displaying, and said sound selecting in such a manner that a plurality of image contents recorded at different time points are read from said data storage and displayed in a single screen and the sound designated by the user is reproduced,

as recited in amended claim 13, so that claim 13 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 16-17 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 13, and include all the features of claim 13, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claims 16-17 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, at pages 7-10, claims 1, 6-9, 12-15, 18-19, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura (U.S. Patent No. 5,970,205) in view of Yonemitsu (U.S. Patent No. 5,592,450).

Neither Nakamura nor Yonemitsu discuss or suggest:

sound select means for selecting a sound designated by a user to be output;

and

information processing means for controlling said data storage means, said image displaying means, and said sound selecting means in such a manner that a plurality of image contents recorded in said image recording means at different time points are read from said data storage means and displayed in a single screen by

said image displaying means and the sound designated by the user is reproduced,

as recited in amended claim 1. In other words, the invention of claim 1 provides for allowing a user to designate a sound to be output and information processing means for reproducing the sound designated by the user. In contrast, neither Nakamura nor Yonemitsu disclose a sound select means for selecting a sound designated by the user to be output and information processing means for reproducing the designated sound. Therefore, even if Nakamura and Yonemitsu were combined, the invention of claim 1 would not result.

Since neither Nakamura nor Yonemitsu, nor the combination thereof, discuss or suggest all of the features of the invention of claim 1, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Similarly, neither Nakamura nor Yonemitsu, nor the combination thereof, discuss or suggest:

selecting a sound designated by a user to be output;

and

controlling said data storage, said displaying, and said selecting in such a manner that a plurality of image contents recorded at different time points are read from said data storage and displayed in a single screen and the sound designated by the user is reproduced,

as recited in amended claim 7, so that claim 7 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 8 depends directly from claim 7, and includes all the features of claim 7, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claim 8 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

Similarly, neither Nakamura nor Yonemitsu, nor the combination thereof, discuss or suggest:

select a sound designated by a user to be output;

and

control said data storage, said image displaying, and said sound selecting in such a manner that a plurality of image contents recorded at different time points are read from said data storage and displayed in a single screen and the sound designated by the user is reproduced,

as recited in amended claim 13, so that claim 13 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Similarly, neither Nakamura nor Yonemitsu, nor the combination thereof, discuss or suggest:

a selector selecting a sound designated by a user to be output;

and

an information processor controlling said data storage, said image display, and said selector in such a manner that a plurality of image contents recorded in said image recorder at different time points are read from said data storage and displayed in a single screen by said image display and the sound designated by the user is reproduced,

as recited in amended claim 19, so that claim 19 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 6, 9, 12, 14-15, 18, and 22 have been cancelled. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, at pages 10-11, claims 4-5, 10-11, 16-17, and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura in view of Yonemitsu and further in view of Akiha et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,377,745).

As discussed above, the combination of Nakamura and Yonemitsu does not discuss or suggest all of the features of each of the inventions of claims 1, 7, 13, and 19. Akiha et al. fails to make up for these deficiencies. Claims 4-5, 10-11, 16-17, and 20-21 depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1, 7, 13, and 19, respectively, and include all the features of claims 1, 7, 13, and 19, respectively, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claims 4-5, 10-11, 16-17, and 20-21 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

III. New Claim

New claim 23 has been added. None of the prior art cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, discusses or suggests:

recording, at different time points, a plurality of image contents and image data including sound data from a video input;

storing the plurality of image contents and image data including sound data from a video input in a randomly accessible data storage;

displaying, at the same time in one screen, the plurality of the image contents recorded at the different time points and read out from said data storage;

selecting a sound designated by a user to be output; and

controlling said data storage, said displaying, and said selecting in such a manner that a plurality of image contents recorded at different time points are read and displayed in a single screen and the sound designated by the user is reproduced,

as recited in claim 23. Therefore, claim 23 patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art for at least the reasons noted above. Thus, it is submitted that claim 23 is in a condition suitable for allowance.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 3-19-07

By: 
Aaron C. Walker
Registration No. 59,921

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501